

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-18, as amended, remain herein. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

1. Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone conference held on August 20, 2008. During the conference, applicants communicated that elements recited in canceled claim 2, “the plurality of semiconductor lasers are arranged in a direction where spread angles of the laser beams are relatively small,” had been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 17. As mentioned in applicants’ April 28, 2008 Amendment and paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Remarks below, the Office Action did not reject applicants’ claim 2 over Suzuki ‘404 or Hooker ‘463. As all remaining claims depend from claim 1 or 17, claims 1 and 3-18 are allowable.

2. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 15 has been amended to moot the rejection.

3. Claims 1-7, 11, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over Fischer ‘009. Fischer’s U.S. filing date of July 1, 2004 fails to antedate applicants’ foreign priority date of December 10, 2003. Applicants submitted a verified English language translation of the priority document on April 30, 2008. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 8-10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Fischer '009. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Fischer '009 and Cohn '761. As discussed above, these rejections are mooted in view of applicants' submission of a verified English language translation of the priority document.

5. Claims 1, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) over Suzuki Japanese Publication No. 2001356404.

Amended claims 1 and 17 incorporate elements previously recited in claim 2 which was not rejected over Suzuki '404. Claims 1, 17 and 18 are thus allowable.

6. Claims 1, 4-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) over Hooker '463.

Amended claim 1 incorporates elements previously recited in claim 2 which was not rejected over Hooker '463. Claims 1, 4-7 and 11 are thus allowable.

7. Applicants appreciate the indication that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants submit, however, that a broader scope of the invention is patentable in view of the art of record.

For all of the foregoing reasons, all claims 1 and 3-18 are now fully in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



---

Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177  
Daniel W. Shim  
Reg. No. 56,995

Date: August 27, 2008

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-6420

Attorney Docket No. 28951.1178